

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Office Action mailed March 24, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Examiner Colan is thanked for the telephone conversation conducted on June 2, 2009. Proposed claim amendments were discussed. Cited art was discussed. It appears that the proposed claim amendments overcome the rejections based on the cited art. The status of previously withdrawn claims was discussed. It appears that, as a result of amendments made to previously withdrawn claims 37-43, claims 37-43 are rejoined with other pending claims for examination. However, Applicants have currently listed each of claims 37-43 under a "withdrawn" status, and will modify the status of these claims upon receiving confirmation from Examiner indicating the rejoined condition. Such confirmation is respectfully requested.

Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1, 6, 7, 25, 30, 31, 37-43, 45-47, and 50-53 are now pending in the present application. Of these pending claims, claims 1, 25, 45 and 50 are currently amended without introduction of new matter; claims 37-43 have been withdrawn as a result of a previous Office action; claims 2-5, 8-24, 26-29, 32-36, 44, 48 and 49 are canceled; claims 6, 7, 30, 31, 46, 47, 51 and 52 are previously presented claims; and claim 53 is a new claim being submitted without introduction of new matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 1, 6-7, 25, 30-31, and 37-47, and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grover et al. (Grover hereinafter) (US 5,818,437).

Response to the Rejection

Applicant respectfully draws attention to a minor typographical oversight in the statement of the rejection on page 2 of the Office action. The statement includes several claims (37-43) that are currently withdrawn, and also includes several claims (45-47 and 50-52) that have apparently not been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claim 1

Applicant has opted to currently amend claim 1 in order to move forward prosecution in the case, and respectfully submits that the claim, at least as amended, is allowable over the cited art. The amended claim includes the steps of identifying a first set of text strings containing a desired text string, followed by identifying a second set of text strings that also contains the desired text string. The second set of text strings contains a fewer number of text strings than the first set of text strings, thereby providing an efficient search result that further eliminates irrelevant text strings. These features have been described in various portions of original specification and illustrated accordingly. As a non-limiting example, attention is drawn to Applicant's Fig. 8, which shows an exemplary first set of text strings ("Steven" and "Sarah" in block 820) and an exemplary second set of text strings ("Steven..." in block 895, where the text string "Sarah" has been eliminated).

In contrast to Applicant's approach, the cited art of Grover fails to show a reduction/narrowing of search results. To elaborate, attention is drawn to Grover's Fig. 10, which shows a search tag "6" resulting in a matching output "I"; followed by a second search tag combination ("65") that results in an expanded and different list of matching outputs ("he" and "i.e.,"); further followed by a third search tag combination ("654") that results in yet another list of different matching outputs ("her" and "hem"). As can be seen neither the first nor the second list of matching outputs include the desired search text (apparently "her" or "hem"), thereby leading to a handicap in the form of an unnecessary number of additional key strokes.

The handicap associated with Grover's approach may best be illustrated by using Grover's system of Fig. 10 for implementing an exemplary process in accordance with

Applicant's claim 1 (assuming *arguendo* that Applicant's claim 1 may indeed be reasonably applied to Grover's system of Fig. 10).

Beginning with Grover's search tag "6" a search of Grover's memory (in accordance with Applicant's method) will result in the following first set of text strings: "I, I'm, if, he, i.e.,, is, her, and hem." When Grover's next search tag ("65") is applied, the first set of text strings will then be reduced to a second set of text strings: "he, i.e., her, and hem". When Grover's next search tag ("654") is applied, the second set of text strings will then be further reduced to a third set of text strings: "her, hem." It can be understood that Applicant's approach allows a user to select the desired text "her" or "hem" as a result of the very first key stroke ("6"), in contrast to Grover's approach which requires three key strokes ("654") before obtaining the desired result. One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that such a reduction/optimization of key strokes provides a distinct and desirable advantage over Grover, thereby making Applicant's claim 1 clearly allowable over the cited art.

(Incidentally, on a different subject, it may be pertinent to point out that Grover adopts an unconventional mapping of letters to numbers in his keys, which he describes in his col. 1, lines 59-64, as follows: "*An important aspect of the invention which allows high efficiency is that the letters are assigned to the keys in a non-sequential order. That is, instead of assigning the letters from a to z in sequential order, the letters are grouped onto keys in a way which reduces the frequency of ambiguities for the words of the English language.*" One of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that this unconventional implementation by Grover presents its own sets of handicaps when using "conventional" devices. Applicant submits new claim 53 to reinforce the advantage provided by Applicant's method vis-à-vis using pre-existing keypads.)

In summary, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Grover, and therefore requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 6 and 7

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Consequently, claims 6 and 7 that are dependent directly or indirectly on

claim 1 are also allowable as a matter of law. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). For at least this reason, Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 6 and 7.

Claim 25

In contrast to claim 1, which is a method claim, Applicant's claim 25 is a system claim. Consequently, the scope of these two claims is distinct and different. However, certain remarks made above with reference to the rejection of claim 1 are equally pertinent to the rejection of claim 25 as well. In the interests of brevity, these remarks will not be repeated herein and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is also allowable at least in currently amended form. Consequently, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 30 and 31

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 25 is allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Consequently, claims 30 and 31 that are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 25 are also allowable as a matter of law. For at least this reason, Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 30 and 31.

Claim 37

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of this claim because the cited art of Grover fails to disclose each element of the claim as required for carrying out a proper rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. 102. For example, on page 6 of the Office action it is alleged that Applicant's "*storing a first number that is the same as the unique number associated with the first alphanumeric key*" is anticipated by Grover's "*Fig. 10, table "Tag Content", and Col. 2, lines 35-39, 45-51, and 56-67, Col. 12, lines 43-49, Grover.*" Applicant respectfully points out that the cited portions of Grover (as well as remaining portions) fail to disclose that the storing of this number is carried out based on "*identifying depression of a first alphanumeric key on the keypad*" and "*identifying depression of a second alphanumeric key on the keypad*" as recited in the claim. One of ordinary skill in the art can recognize that Grover's memory (alleged "table") can be programmed in a variety of ways. Consequently, it is improper on the part of the Office

action to jump to the conclusion that his memory has been programmed by identifying key depressions in the manner cited in Applicant's claim 37.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 102 is improper and hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of the claim.

Claims 38-43

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 37 is allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Consequently, claims 38-44 that are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 37 are also allowable as a matter of law. For at least this reason, Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 38-44.

Claims 44, 48 and 49

Applicant has canceled claims 44, 48 and 49 and respectfully submits that the rejection of these claims has been rendered moot as a result of the cancellation.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Statement of the Rejection

Claims 45-47, and 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grover et al. (Grover hereinafter) (US 5,818,437) in view of Griffin et al. (Griffin hereinafter)(US 7,227,536).

Response to the Rejection

Claims 45-47

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 45-47, specifically the reasons provided for modifying Grover in view of Griffin. However, in the interests of brevity, Applicant has opted not to delve into details for the traversal because claims 45-47 are dependent indirectly on claim 1, which is allowable of reasons provided above, thereby making claims 45-47 allowable as well. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 45-47.

Claims 50-52

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 50-52, specifically the reasons provided for modifying Grover in view of Griffin. However, in the interests of brevity, Applicant has opted not to delve into details for the traversal because claims 50-52 are dependent indirectly on claim 25, which is allowable of reasons provided above, thereby making claims 50-52 allowable as well. Consequently, for at least this reason, Applicant hereby requests withdrawal of the rejection followed by allowance of claims 50-52.

Cited Art Made of Record

The cited art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2835/306097.01
Application No.: 10/722,987
Office Action Dated: March 24, 2009

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 6, 7, 25, 30, 31, 37-43, 45-47, and 50-53 are allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative.

Date: June 24, 2009

/Joseph F. Oriti/
Joseph F. Oriti
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439